

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 and 37-46 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 27 have been canceled, claims 2 and 5 have been rewritten in independent form, claims 28-31 and 35 have been amended to change the dependency to claim 10, and claim 47 has been added, leaving claims 2-26, 28-35 and 37-47 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. As will be discussed in detail below, it is believed that the application is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-7, 9-12, 38-45 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuura et al. (US 6,175,186) (“Matsuura”). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 2-4 and 12 include the following limitation: “said pair of substrates are adhered to one another by a sealing material disposed surrounding at least said display region, so as to seal said display region including said organic electroluminescent element.” Matsuura does not teach or suggest that limitation.

Matsuura describes that a resin having a desiccant mixed therein is provided, as an inter-layer insulating film, on a lower electrode which forms a non-light-emitting portion of an EL element and that a moisture absorbing layer is provided between an opposing substrate (a sealing plate 7) and a substrate (substrate 2). There is nothing in Matsuura that describes a sealing material disposed surrounding at least said display region, so as to seal said display region including said organic electroluminescent element.

In addition, claims 3-4 include the following limitation: “said resin having said desiccant mixed therein is used as said sealing material.” A resin having a desiccant mixed therein, as described in Matsuura, is different from a resin that is a sealing material. Matsuura does not disclose a mixture of a desiccant into a sealing material, as required by the claimed invention. Thus, Matsuura does not disclose, teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 2-4 and 12. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection regarding claims 2-4 and 12 be withdrawn.

Claims 5-7 include the following limitation: “said resin is disposed surrounding said display region.” Matsuura does not disclose, teach, or suggest that limitation.

As set forth above, Matsuura describes that a resin having a desiccant mixed therein is

provided, as an inter-layer insulating film, on a lower electrode which forms a non-light-emitting portion of an EL element and that a moisture absorbing layer is provided between an opposing substrate (a sealing plate 7) and a substrate (substrate 2). Thus, Matsuura only describes that a resin having a desiccant mixed therein is provided surrounding the so-called pixel electrode. Matsuura does not disclose providing a resin having a desiccant mixed therein so as to surround the whole of the display region, as required by the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection regarding claims 5-7 be withdrawn.

Claims 9-11 include the following limitation: “said resin having said desiccant mixed therein is located in a gap between said pair of substrates and covers at least said display region.” There is nothing in Matsuura that discloses a gap, much less a resin having a desiccant mixed therein located in the gap. In addition, Matsuura does not disclose that the resin having the desiccant mixed therein covers the display region. Thus, Matsuura does not disclose teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 9-11. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection regarding claims 9-11 be withdrawn.

Claims 38-45 include the following limitation: “a resin having a desiccant mixed therein is disposed between said pair of substrates such that said resin surrounds said self-emissive element comprising said first electrode, said emissive layer, and said second electrode.” As explained above, Matsuura only describes that a resin having a desiccant mixed therein is provided surrounding the so-called pixel electrode. Matsuura does not disclose providing a resin having a desiccant mixed therein so as to surround said self-emissive element comprising said first electrode, said emissive layer, and said second electrode, as required by the claimed invention.

In addition, claims 39-40 include the following limitation: “said pair of substrates are adhered to one another by a sealing material disposed surrounding at least said display region, so as to seal said display region including said self-emissive element.” Claim 40 includes the following limitation: “said resin having said desiccant mixed therein is used as said sealing material.” As explained above, Matsuura does not disclose these limitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection regarding claims 38-45 be withdrawn.

Claims 8, 14, 26, 35, and 46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matsuura.

Claim 8 includes the limitations of claim 5. Claim 14 includes the limitations of claim 9. Claim 35 includes the limitations of claims 9 and 10. Claim 46 includes the

limitations of claim 38. For all of the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5, 9, and 38, Matsuura does not teach all of the limitations of claims 8, 14, 35, and 46.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as to claims 8, 14, 35, and 46 be withdrawn.

Claim 26 includes the limitations of claim 15. Applicants notes that claim 15 was not rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsuura. Claim 26 includes the following limitation: “said pair of substrates are adhered to one another by a sealing material disposed surrounding at least said display region, so as to seal said display region; a groove is formed in at least one of said pair of substrates on a side facing the other substrate in a location where said sealing material is disposed; and a desiccant is filled in said groove.” Matsuura does not teach or suggest those limitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection as to claim 26 be withdrawn.

Claims 13, 15-25, 27-34, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable Matsuura in view of Ebisawa et al. (US 6,284,342) (“Ebisawa”).

Applicants respectfully request that Ebisawa be removed as a reference against claims 15-25 and 37. Applicants submit that the invention claimed in claims 15, 16, 18-21, 24, and 37 was conceived and reduced to practice by September 30, 1998, which is before the filing date of Ebisawa. Applicants submit herewith a Declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 and a translation of Japanese patent application 10-277997, which sets forth the necessary evidence that the invention was conceived and reduced to practice by September 30, 1998. Moreover, because Ebisawa must be removed as a reference for claim 15, Ebisawa must also be removed as a reference against claims 16-25 because claims 16-25 include all of the limitations of claim 15.

Claim 13 has been amended to depend from claim 9. Thus, the rejection as to claim 13 is now moot.

As for claims 27-34, claim 27 has been canceled and claims 28-31 have been amended to depend from claim 10. Thus, the rejections as to claims 27-34 are moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants’ attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Lisa A. Bongiovi
Registration No. 48,933
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

November 18, 2003